0.30 ± 0.81. Overall correlation between CEAP and VCSS was moderately strong (r_s = 0.49; P < .0001), with the highest correlation for attributes-reflecting more advanced disease, including varicose vein (r_s= 0.51; P < .0001), pigmentation (r_s= 0.39; P < .0001), inflammation (r_s= 0.28; P < .0001), induration (r_s = 0.22; P < .0001), and edema (r_s= 0.21; P < .0001). Based on the modified CIVIQ assessment, overall mean scores for each general category were QOL-Pain, 6.04 ± 3.12 (range, 3-15), QOL-Functional, 9.90 ± 5.32 (range, 5-25), and QOL-Social, 5.41 ± 3.09 (range, 3-15). The overall correlation between CIVIQ and VCSS was moderately strong (r_s= 0.43; P< .0001), with the highest correlation noted for pain (r_s= 0.55; P< .0001) and edema (r_s = 0.30; P< .0001). Screening venous ultrasound results showed reflux in 38% of limbs and 2% obstruction in the femoral, saphenous, or popliteal vein segments. Correlation between overall venous ultrasound findings (reflux + obstruction) and VCSS was slightly positive (r_s= 0.23; P< .0001) but was highest for varicose vein (r_s= 0.32; P < .0001) and showed no correlation to swelling (r_s= 0.06; P < .0001) and pain (r_s= 0.003; P < .0001).

Conclusions: Although there is correlation between VCSS, CEAP, modified CIVIQ, and venous ultrasound findings, subgroup analysis indicates that this correlation is driven by different components of VCSS compared with the other venous assessment tools. This observation may reflect that VCSS has more global application in determining overall severity of venous disease, while at the same time highlighting the strengths of the other venous assessment tools. With update of VCSS planned in the near future, validation of any revised VCSS should factor in the correlation of VCSS with other venous assessment tools.

American Venous Forum membership: Who are We and Where are We Going?

J. M. Lohr, *Cincinnati, Ohio*
From Lohr Surgical Specialists, LLC.

Background: The American Venous Forum (AVF) membership was surveyed regarding their current certification and professional activities.

Methods: The certification survey was forwarded to all of the members of the AVF with a 28% response rate.

Results: Of the respondents, currently one-third have a practice limited to venous disease and two-thirds have a mixed practice. Ninety-one percent have hospital privileges that are active, and 9% do not have hospital privileges. Fifty-two percent of respondents have active privileges in an outpatient surgery center, and 48% do not participate in an outpatient surgery center. Twenty percent have a practice limited to office procedures, and 80% have a mixed practice. Sixty-five percent of the membership is board certified in vascular surgery. Several other boards are represented amongst the membership, for example: general surgery, cardiothoracic, and family practice. Respondents identified issues with hospital emergency department call coverage, endovascular privileges, or described their practice as established before vascular board certification. Emergency department call requirements appear to have regional variations with a variety of requirements for hospital privileges. Several respondents plan to limit their scope of practice to venous disease only. Many respondents identified the circular logic of the need for hospital privileges to maintain certification. Many respondents also identified the requirement for a minimum number of procedures to maintain hospital privileges while their scope of practice is still limited. This was especially problematic for arterial procedures in a practice limited to venous disease. As venous stenting, mechanical thrombectomy and thrombolytic therapies evolve, the scope of venous practice will become more diversified. The need for hospital privileges is a current requirement of the Board of Surgery for maintenance of certification.

Conclusions: Many members of the AFV have identified these issues as an impediment to board certification. Several respondents, however, identified vascular certification as a bad idea. Modular maintenance of certification was also thought to be a poor solution by some of the membership. Several members suggested a separate standard be applied to those specializing solely in venous disease. The American Board of Surgery will need to address the current requirements as maintenance of certification moves forward. The results of this survey have been shared with the American Board of Surgery.

Penetrating Inferior Vena Cava Injuries are Associated with Thromboembolic Complications: A Review of the National Trauma Data Bank

F. L. Joglar, P. Shaw, R. Eberhardt, N. Hamburg, J. Kalish, D. Rybin, G. Doros, and **A. Farber,** *Boston, Mass*
From Boston University Medical Center.

Background: Prior studies suggest that inferior vena cava (IVC) injuries have high lethality and may increase the rate of thromboembolic complications in survivors. We sought to define the effect of penetrating IVC injury on thromboembolism risk in a large, comprehensive, nationwide registry of trauma patients.

Methods: We conducted a case-control study derived from prospectively collected data from the National Trauma Data Bank (NTDB). Cases, identified by *International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision* codes, were patients aged 18 to 65 years who had penetrating abdominal trauma and IVC injury. Controls were patients with penetrating abdominal injury and no IVC injury. We excluded patients with previously diagnosed deep venous thrombosis (DVT), concomitant lower extremity vascular or skeletal injury, pelvic fracture, head trauma, or spinal cord injuries. Comparative analyses of demographics, injury severity scores, type of penetrating injury, complications, and outcomes were performed.

Results: We identified 590 patients with penetrating IVC injuries and 13,061 controls with penetrating abdominal injuries without IVC injury among 1,309,311 patients in the data set. Of patients with IVC injury, 256 (43.4%) underwent some form of open repair or ligation. No endovascular repairs were reported. Demographic and outcome data are reported in the Table. Patients with IVC injury were more commonly African American and more likely to be treated at a university hospital. IVC injury was associated more frequently with gunshot wounds. Patients with IVC injury had evidence of greater injury severity, with lower presenting systolic blood pressure, higher injury severity scores, and longer intensive care unit and overall length of stay. In patients with IVC injury, the incidence of DVT was 2.88%. There was no difference in IVC filter use. Compared with control patients, patients with IVC injury had a higher risk of DVT (odds ratio, 2.4; 95% confidence interval, 1.4-3.9; P = .001). There were no differences in limb complications, including compartment syndrome, fasciotomy, or amputation, but we did confirm higher mortality in patients with IVC injury.

Table. Demographic and outcome data

Variable	*IVC injury*	*No IVC injury*	*P*
Patients, No.	590	13,061	
Age, mean ± SD, y	29.8 ± 10.2	30.9 ± 10.7	.018
Male, No. (%)	538 (91.2)	11,813 (90.4)	.566
Race, No. (%)			
African American	287 (48.6)	5,097 (39.0)	<.001
Hispanic	117(19.8)	3,090 (23.7)	
Caucasian	105(17.8)	3,248(24.9)	
Other	40 (6.78)	865 (6.62)	
Hospital type, No. (%)			
University	396 (67.1)	8,117 (62.1)	.013
Community	156 (26.4)	3,751 (28.7)	
Nonteaching	21 (3.56)	777 (5.95)	
Mechanism, No. (%)			
Firearm	487 (82.5)	7,688 (58.9)	<.001
Stab injury	98 (16.6)	5,141 (39.4)	
ED SBP, mean ± SD	93.4 ± 52.2	120.6 ± 39.7	<.001
ISS, mean ± SD	25.7 ± 14.9	15.2 ± 12.0	<.001
LOS, mean ± SD			
ICU	6.06 ± 10.9	3.78 ± 9.39	<.001
Overall	12.0 ± 19.9	9.83 ± 14.2	<.001
DVT, No. (%)	17 (2.88)	162 (1.24)	<.001
Pulmonary embolism, No. (%)	5 (0.85)	60 (0.46)	.18
IVC filter (%)	4 (0.68)	66 (0.51)	.565
Compartment syndrome, No. (%)	5 (0.85)	80 (0.61)	.478
Fasciotomy, No. (%)	7 (1.19)	134 (1.03)	.706
Amputation, No. (%)	2 (0.34)	19 (0.15)	.241
Pneumonia, No. (%)	32 (5.42)	463 (3.54)	.017
Mortality, No. (%)	306 (51.9)	1413 (10.8)	<.001

DVT, Deep venous thrombosis; *ED,* emergency department; *ICU,* intensive care unit; *ISS,* injury severity score; *IVC,* inferior vena cava; *LOS,* length of stay; *SBP,* systolic blood pressure; *SD,* standard deviation.

Conclusions: Patients with IVC injury have a higher risk of DVT than those with penetrating intra-abdominal injury alone. Penetrating IVC injury is associated with increased injury severity and mortality. Our findings emphasize the importance of developing appropriate surveillance and prevention strategies to reduce the rate of venous thromboembolism in patients with IVC injury.